

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 15 have been amended. New claims 16-27 have been added. Claims 2 and 5-14 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 15-27 are now pending in the application. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the amendments and remarks provided below.

Objection to the Title

The title of the invention has been objected to be allegedly not being descriptive. Applicant has amended the title to recite a RECEIVING APPARATUS AND RECEIVING METHOD OF REDUCED POWER CONSUMPTION FOR RECEIVING A BROADCAST TRANSMISSION. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the title of the invention is respectfully requested.

Applicant has also editorially amended the Abstract to improve clarity and format as a single paragraph.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) - Shigihara et al.

Claims 1, 3, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Shigihara et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,966,186; hereinafter "Shigihara"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding amended claim 1, the claimed invention recites a receiving apparatus for receiving a broadcast transmission comprising

a signal-processing unit for processing the received signal at a plurality of stages;

a judgment device for determining whether or not it is normal to process

the signal in at least one of the stages by the signal-processing unit; and
a control device for cutting a power supply for later stages after a non-
normal operation stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for
at least one of the stages to process the signal. (emphasis added)

In the claimed invention, by cutting a power supply for later stages after a non-normal operation stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for at least one of the stages to process the signal, it is possible to efficiently eliminate unnecessary operation and to effectively reduce power consumption.

Shigihara does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Shigihara relates to a totally different invention accomplishing a drastically different objective. In Shigihara, an error rate is obtained, which is then converted into the receiving signal quality for indicating on a TV screen. There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Shigihara of “a judgment device for determining whether or not it is normal to process the signal in at least one of the stages by the signal-processing unit; and a control device for cutting a power supply for later stages after a non-normal operation stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for at least one of the stages to process the signal,” as recited by amended claim 1.

Therefore, the claimed invention as recited by amended claim 1 is distinguished over Shigihara. Applicant’s claim 15 recites a related method, and is distinguished over the Shigihara for analogous reasons as discussed above. Claim 3 is a dependent claim including all of the elements of independent claim 1 and intervening claim 16. Therefore, claim 3 is distinguished over the Shigihara for the aforementioned reasons as well as for its additionally recites elements.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
US Application No. 10/689,730
Attorney Docket No. Q78065

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) - Aihara

Claims 1, 4 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Aihara (U.S. Patent Number 5,701,599). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding amended claim 1, Aihara also does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Aihara relates to a totally different invention accomplishing a drastically different objective. In Aihara, a power supply to an apparatus main body is stopped is it is detected that the reception condition is not good. The power supply is restarted upon detection that a good reception condition is attained.

There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Aihara of “a judgment device for determining whether or not it is normal to process the signal in at least one of the stages by the signal-processing unit; and a control device for cutting a power supply for later stages after a non-normal operation stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for at least one of the stages to process the signal,” as recited by amended claim 1. Nowhere Aihara is the cutting of a power supply for later stages mentioned or suggested.

Therefore, the claimed invention as recited by amended claim 1 is distinguished over Aihara. Applicant’s claim 15 recites a related method, and is distinguished over the Aihara for analogous reasons as discussed above. Claim 4 is a dependent claim including all of the elements of independent claim 1 and intervening claims 3 and 16. Therefore, claim 4 is distinguished over the Aihara for the aforementioned reasons as well as for its additionally

recites elements. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) - Obuchi

Claims 1 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Obuchi (U.S. Patent Number 6,741,293). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding amended claim 1, Obuchi also does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Obuchi relates to a totally different invention accomplishing a drastically different objective. In Obuchi, a switching control (6) switches between either digital or analog signals to a speaker (7) and a display (8) according to the conditions of the received digital and/or analog broadcast waves. Obuchi's receiver can continue image outputs by switching to the analog broadcast when digital broadcast outputs can not be obtained.

There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Obuchi of "a judgment device for determining whether or not it is normal to process the signal in at least one of the stages by the signal-processing unit; and a control device for cutting a power supply for later stages after a non-normal operation stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for at least one of the stages to process the signal," as recited by amended claim 1. Obuchi merely deals with switching between analog and digital signals, and does not even mention or suggest a cutting of a power supply for later stages in an apparatus in which a received signal is processed in a plurality of stages.

Therefore, the claimed invention as recited by amended claim 1 is distinguished over Obuchi. Applicant's claim 15 recites a related method, and is distinguished over the Obuchi for

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
US Application No. 10/689,730
Attorney Docket No. Q78065

analogous reasons as discussed above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) - Takashima et al.

Claims 1 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Takashima et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,969,634; “Takashima”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding amended claim 1, Takashima also does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Takashima relates to a totally different invention accomplishing a drastically different objective. In Takashima, the operation of a reception circuit is stopped and activated based on a sync signal detection and counter operation.

There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Takashima of “a judgment device for determining whether or not it is normal to process the signal in at least one of the stages by the signal-processing unit; and a control device for cutting a power supply for later stages after a non-normal operation stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for at least one of the stages to process the signal,” as recited by amended claim 1. Takashima merely deals with activating and stopping operation of a reception circuit, and does not even mention or suggest a cutting of a power supply for later stages in an apparatus in which a received signal is processed in a plurality of stages.

Therefore, the claimed invention as recited by amended claim 1 is distinguished over Takashima. Applicant’s claim 15 recites a related method, and is distinguished over the

Takashima for analogous reasons as discussed above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Newly Added Claims

Applicants have added new claims 16-27, which are allowable over the cited references based on their dependencies as well as for their additionally recited features.

In particular regards to claim 16, “the judgment device determines whether or not it is normal to process the signal at the tuner based on the receiving power of the tuner, and the control device cuts the power supply for later stages after the tuner stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for the tuner to process the signal.” This is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

In particular regards to claim 17, “the judgment device determines whether or not it is normal to process the signal at the demodulation unit based on whether or not synchronization is obtained during demodulation, and the control device cuts the power supply for later stages after the demodulation unit stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for the demodulation unit to process the signal.” This is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

In particular regards to claim 18, “the judgment device determines whether or not it is normal to process the signal at the error-correction unit based on a bit-error rate during error correction, and the control device cuts the power supply for later stages after the error correction unit stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for the error-correction unit to process the signal.” This is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
US Application No. 10/689,730
Attorney Docket No. Q78065

In particular regards to claim 19, "the judgment device determines whether or not it is normal to process the signal at the decoding unit based on a bit-error rate during decoding, and the control device cuts the power supply for later stages after the decoding unit stage when the judgment device determines it is not normal for the decoding unit to process the signal." This is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Lenny R. Jiang
Registration No. 52,432

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 21, 2006